RATING OF SCHOLARLY JOURNALS BY CHAIRPERSONS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

T. M. Nelson, A. R. Buss, and M. Katzko

Names of journals falling in the areas of anthropology, economics, geography, history, philosophy, political science, and sociology were mailed to department chairpersons in these disciplines in U.S. and Canadian universities. Chairpersons were asked to assign numerical ratings using a 1–5 point scale in order to represent the quality of those journals they were familiar with. They were also asked to add journals which they thought should have been included in the original list. The resulting data provide (1) a basis for classifying journals into categories representing their visibility relative to other journals within a particular discipline, and (2) provide average rankings of quality for individual journals. The paper also reviews options generally available in assessing journal quality and describes possible use of such data in the context of the university, particularly in respect to personnel decisions.

An important responsibility of academic administrators and committees involves periodic evaluation of academic staff for promotion and/or tenure consideration. While no system is perfect in this area, certain guidelines and criteria have evolved over the years to help evaluation committees carry out their charge in as judicious and objective a manner as possible.

The first step involves identifying categories of activities to be considered in the evaluation. The categories typically used are teaching, research, professional and public service, and administration. The second step is to weight each category. Different universities place varying weights on each of the above categories, and even within a university, there are faculty differences. However, some combination of teaching and research is almost always accorded the greatest importance.

The third step is to determine the types of evidence appropriate to the evaluation. It is inevitable that a review committee will ask how a judgment of quality can be made. At the very least a statement is required as to whether

T. M. Nelson, A. R. Buss, and M. Katzko, The University of Alberta.
A. R. Buss is now at The University of Calgary.

Research in Higher Education © Agathon Press, Inc. Vol. 19, No. 4, 1983

a faculty member's publications are in "good," "recognized," "respectable," "professional," "in-house," or "popular" sources, with appropriate weightings being implied.

One of the authors, who has participated in many thousands of reviews spanning a number of years, believes that it is important for interdisciplinary review committees to consider the determination of evidence very carefully. The majority of personal decisions present few problems, but there are a significant percentage that do. Experience leads to the belief that problems arise whenever committee members are unable to put the evidence for a particular recommendation into proper perspective. Two concrete examples may give this observation substance.

An untenured associate professor had been awarded multiple salary increments by an interdisciplinary review committee for two years upon the basis of a rapidly expanding publication record. However, this person was now working in a highly specialized area involving language, about which almost no one on the committee, including his chairperson, knew very much. In the third year doubt began to creep in and the award was sharply reduced. Shortly afterwards another committee, differently constructed, judged the same publication record as insufficient for tenure. The grounds for the negative decision were that the publications were of poor quality, the journals that were accepting his papers were not sufficiently professional, and that publication gave too little assurance that quality contributions would be made in the future. The staff member appealed, citing the favorable reviews coming from the other committee, claiming that this constituted encouragement to develop in the direction that he had taken. The appeals resulting cost the university hundreds of thousands of dollars and did considerable professional and personal damage to the academic involved. The matter might have been avoided entirely if the salaries and promotions committee had obtained better evidence about quality in the first instance.

On the second case the record of a staff member in another faculty was consistently denigrated. The departmental chairperson denied the importance of this person's research, and in consequence the academic received poor rewards for several years. This mistaken impression was rectified when a book authored by the staff member was given excellent reviews. These reviews served to call all the chairperson's earlier evaluations into question since he had also denigrated the book in strong terms. A special committee was created which soon established that most of the "inferior" work had been appearing in a demanding journal with which the chairperson was not fully familiar. Later attempts to redress the damage to the scholarly reputation of the staff member were only partially successful.

These are two dramatic examples of error, but the same considerations enter in a more subtle way in cases where recommendations are less extreme.

It should be recognized that there are a large number of journals being published in most disciplines at the present time, each journal representing various degrees of specialization. It is difficult to conceive of any one committee person being able to competently evaluate all publications and compare all journals even within his or her own discipline sheerly on the basis of personal knowledge. This problem is multiplied as the number of disciplines is increased. The difficulty well-intended committee members have in making independent judgments in disciplines other than their own is hard to overestimate. There seems to be a great need for development of some guidelines about the quality of publication that is portable between disciplines.

We propose that journal ratings can be used for this purpose. Even though great caution needs to be exercised in using perceptions of the quality and prestige of journals to arrive at academic judgments since journal rating data is clearly not a sufficient standard by itself, we believe journal rating data can serve as a valuable benchmark. However, before describing the approach we have taken, we will describe some of the procedures currently used in judging the quality of research and point out the advantages peer ratings of journal quality and prestige have in relation to these.

PROCEDURES CURRENTLY USED TO EVALUATE SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS

Evaluations can be based upon several kinds of evidence. Some evidence pertains directly to the publications. *Direct* evidence can appear either in the form of peer reviews of articles or books or as a count of the citations a particular article or articles or a particular individual receives. There are other kinds of evidence which are *indirect* in that they rely upon measures applied to journals publishing the articles. Journal ratings are indirect measures. They can be based upon journal indexing data such as rates of acceptance and rejection of submissions, citation counts representing the frequency with which publications in a particular journal are cited by others, and peer ratings of journal quality. There is already a considerable literature relating to some of these forms of evaluation, particularly use of citation data. This, however, will be reviewed only in terms of its importance to improvement of interdisciplinary evaluation of research records.

DIRECT EVALUATION BY PEER READERS

Typically a set of articles are selected out as being particularly important to the decision making process. These are submitted to adjudicators who are usually not members of the interdisciplinary committee. The adjudicators

study them and afterwards compare or rate their quality using some previously agreed upon criteria. Commonly a peer body of experts are asked to read and comment with reference to general excellence, visibility, and impact upon other scholars and consumers of research information. Direct peer review is a valuable method to use at times where special awards are at issue. However, it is cumbersome and expensive to administrate and not suitable for routine use.

Unfortunately, intrinsic evaluations are frequently attempted by a single chairperson, or a group of conveniently available colleagues, or an interdisciplinary group of administrators. Serious problems do arise when the degree of merit represented in a particular record of publication is evaluated in this way. For obvious reasons persons with general qualifications are wise not to rely too heavily upon their own judgments as regards quality, but to seek out other types of objective information.

DIRECT EVALUATIONS BY CITATION COUNTS

Citation indexes measure the frequency with which published materials have been cited by others in their publications. The reasons for citation seem to be very complex (Martyn, 1975), and the use of the index is often difficult to justify.

There are also several technical problems which arise when citation indexes are used. First, it takes a long time to derive a citation index for a particular publication because the measure requires citations by others in their subsequent publications, and hence the index is not so suitable for use at salary and promotions meetings where the previous year's publication is at issue, as for tenure or promotions hearings where cumulative records are considered. Second, there are tremendous differences in citation habits between disciplines (Garfield, 1963) making cross-disciplinary comparisons contentious. Third, there is the problem of multiple authorship. Since citations are given only to the first listed author of an article, it is usually necessary to derive the index for an individual from research done under other names. Also, some disciplines or working groups actually assign authorship alphabetically or rotate it. Searching out true authorship is, of course, just a special aspect of the problem of multiauthorship: the problem of how to compare papers written by one author with those written by many authors exists in every type of productivity analysis.

INDIRECT EVALUATION USING JOURNAL INDEXING PROCEDURES

These procedures typically involve considering data provided by the journals themselves in the form of acceptance policies, rejection rate, and num-

ber of subscribers. It is doubtless useful to distinguish refereed from nonrefereed journals. Going beyond this, rejection rates and size of circulation are sometimes cited as criteria when they are available. Their use is limited because many journals, particularly British journals, do not make information about rejection rates available (e.g., see data entries in Sussman, 1978). In addition, acceptance/rejection rates often reflect the amount of space available to cover a particular content area and not quality directly. Rejection rates can reflect changes in publication policies or lack of clarity about these, too. A large circulation is an inappropriate indication of quality when it is confounded with popularity. Also, there are a group of journals with low subscriptions to be found in most university libraries even if they are not subscribed to by large numbers of individuals.

INDIRECT EVALUATION USING CITATION COUNT PROCEDURES

This method of journal rating proceeds by selecting a "source list" of journals. From this source list a count is made of all (or possibly some subset) of citations to other journals. One danger here is that the final ranking will be biased by the nature and number of journals in the source list. A large source list selected across a variety of journal types gives the most generalizable journal rankings. Second, the method of citation counting assumes that a given citation reflects a judgment of quality or contribution to knowledge on the part of the citer. Again, there are numerous reasons for citing an article, only a few of which may be related to quality (e.g., Martyn, 1975). Finally, citation measures are influenced by the size of the journal. The larger the journal, the more articles it will contain for potential citation. A common corrective measure for this bias is to compute an "impact factor." The total number of citations received by a journal is divided by the number of articles which that journal published. Despite the reservations the method is probably valid for the journals dealt with: the citation indexes give results comparable to journal ratings by peers (e.g., Baughman, 1974; Singleton, 1976; Rushton and Roediger, 1978; Line, 1979; McAllister, Anderson, and Narin, 1980). Very frequently, however, interdisciplinary review involves groups of journals not included in citation counts.

INDIRECT EVALUATION BY PEER JOURNAL RATING

In peer rating procedures, a sample of academics considered to competently represent the breadth of a discipline (such as professors or chairpersons) are asked to evaluate a list of publications closely related to the discipline on dimensions representing quality. A major issue here concerns the nature of the rating population. As raters' judgments will be affected

by their specific interests and by their degree of familiarity with a set of journals, caution should be exercised in transferring a ranking from one rater group to another. The reference group should be carefully selected. As Mace and Warner say in reporting ratings of psychology journals, "While there is sufficient correspondence to indicate differences in journal ratings, there also appears to be a reflection of departmental orientation and the personal preferences of chairmen" (1973, p. 186).

Glenn (1971) makes a similar point while reporting evaluations of sociological journals. Concern should be also shown for the content and size of the list of journals to be rated. A large list, although complete, leaves the ranking vulnerable to the degree of familiarity the rater has with low profile journals. Conversely, a restricted list may exclude high quality but highly specialized journals. Finally, journals differ among themselves in a number of ways, such as degree of technicality, degree of specialization, or orientation (experimental, exploratory, review, theoretical, descriptive). A simple rating on a single scale of "quality," although generally valid, will not be sensitive to these differences. For example, two journals might be rated equally highly, but for different reasons. On the other hand, a given rater could conceivably restrict his evaluations to a single criterion, such as experimental content. As a consequence, a theoretically or descriptively oriented journal would be given a low rating in comparison to journals devoted to the rater's field of specialization.

A source of information that would seem most helpful to interdisciplinary committees charged with making annual reviews would be a comprehensive set of peer journal ratings arrived at using a common methodology. A set of such ratings would allow for cross-discipline comparisons. In order to have such a measure in a reliable form, substantial sample size journal lists are necessary, making the initial undertaking a somewhat laborious procedure. On the other hand, once the norms for each discipline have been established, they can be used with little effort to provide a quick indication of the quality of an individual's publications. The present study is a preliminary attempt at establishing the significance of a substantial number of journals to a number of scientific disciplines.

PEER REVIEW OF JOURNALS IN 24 FIELDS

The procedure followed began by asking a substantial number of prominent individuals in each discipline to assess the value to that discipline of a substantial number of journals. This portion of our study was directed toward the disciplines of anthropology, astrophysics, biology, chemistry, crystallography, economics, genetics, geography, geology, geophysics, geoscience, history, marine biology, mathematics, microbiology, optics, philosophy, physical chemistry, political science, organic chemistry, statistics,

physics, sociology, and zoology. (The data not reported here are undergoing preparation for a later report.)

Appropriate journal lists were addressed to the chairpersons of each discipline in 65 U.S. and 18 Canadian universities. Lists were prepared after consulting the Science Citation Index and the Social Sciences Citation Index. These indexes provide lists of journal titles arranged by subject category. The sample of potential respondents was geographically representative of major universities in these two countries. The social sciences questionnaires were sent to 581 departments, and 246 replied, yielding a 42% return rate. The 913 departments to which natural science questionnaires were sent yielded 275 completed questionnaires, an acceptable 30% return rate. The return rate was somewhat less for the natural sciences as compared to the social sciences (30% as compared to 42%, respectively). Part of the reason for this was that the social sciences chosen were much more likely to exist as separate departments. Within each group there did not appear to be interdepartmental differences in the return rate.

Fourteen (14) questionnaires were returned uncompleted with explanatory notes. A small number in this group did not understand the directions. They assumed that they were required to rate every journal and declined because of unfamiliarity with some publications or because they did not have the time to read recent issues of each journal. Another few persons did not find the journals listed the appropriate ones. Several letters were received criticizing the methodology employed or the value of the project. All comments taken together ranged from very favorable to occasional outright hostility.

PROCEDURE

Recipients were instructed as follows: "Please assign numbers to the journals listed below according to how you would rate them, where 5 = Outstanding, 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Adequate, 1 = Poor. You may leave blanks if you do not recognize a journal. If there are journals not included which you think should be, indicate them at the end and rate them." Notice that recipients were asked not to rate journals with which they were not sufficiently familiar. This was done to increase the validity of the results. Conversely, we asked recipients to add journals which were not included on the list in order to ensure that the final journal lists adequately covered the major journals in each discipline.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results are summarized for each discipline in Tables 1–7, which follow this section. Here journals are organized into four categories. The first

three categories are named "high," "moderate," and "low visibility." All these journals were on the original rating list. A highly visible journal is defined as one for which 75% or more of the respondents provided a rating. A moderately visible journal is one for which 25% to 74% of the respondents provided a rating. A low visibility journal is one for which less than 25% of the respondents provided a rating. The fourth category includes only those journal titles which the raters provided. Within each of the four categories journals are rank-ordered from high to low as determined by the mean rating. The standard deviation and number of raters for each journal (*N*) are also given for each journal.

Mean journal ratings are moderately correlated with the number of ratings made of journals on the original list when those eliciting fewer than five responses are excluded: *r*'s range from .29 to .92 across the seven disciplines. There seems to be a tendency for persons to be familiar with the better journals, although the distributions of ratings for highly, moderately, and least visible categories overlap greatly in most fields. Added journals are almost always given high ratings, possibly because of idiosyncracies in the definition of scholarly fields.

In this regard it is interesting to consider the number of journals that chairpersons are familiar with in their own disciplines. Inspection of data used to prepare Tables 1–7 show that the average respondent rated comparatively few journals. This is itself a strong argument for supplementing salaries and promotions deliberations, tenure review, etc., with evidence other than that supplied by professional experience alone.

The rankings within each table generally speak for themselves. However, while the range of rankings is usually quite similar, these exceptions are sharp enough to question the wisdom of using rank numbers per se in making cross-disciplinary comparisons. For example, it is disconcerting that geography shows no rating higher than 3.95 and 3.21, respectively, within the highly and moderately visible categories. Whether the numerical *ranks* tabled represent the true interval relationships between journals or some systematic differences between fields in rating habits isn't known. Considering this, it seems safest to use the rank number in combination with the particular visibility category citing the number of journals in that category (e.g., *Philosophy of Science* would be said to rank 4 in a range of 15 journals considered to be highly visible by chairpersons in the field of Philosophy; *Population* ranks 3 in a range of 20 journals considered to be moderately visible in the field of Sociology, etc.).

This leads to consideration of other kinds of errors to which uncritical use of these journal ratings could lead. At the risk of being tedious and seeming overcautious, six other dangers will be mentioned.

First, comparisons using visibility categories and rank numbers give only very general information about research reports. Since general information

about something unknown is more valuable than something known, the value of peer ratings is greater for interdisciplinary comparisons than for intradisciplinary comparisons. Intradisciplinary value is not completely lost, however, because we have found that the average chairperson is not comfortable about making decisions for more than a few journals within his or her own discipline.

Second, average ratings do not measure the quality of individual contributions. There is a considerable range of quality within every journal, probably reflecting interactions between different types of manuscripts and abilities of reviewers. In this regard Teevan (1980) compared prestige ratings of sociological journals derived from ratings on evaluations of quality for actual articles published in the journals. He found more variation in quality ratings within than between journals. The effect was strong enough to allow him to derive a different mean order of journal prestige from measurements of article quality. Cole and Cole (1971) and Chubin (1973) make this point in relation to the *Science Citation Index* too; Chubin states: "Just as the quantity of one's publications is not linear in relation to one's impact on the discipline, neither are SCI counts linear in relation to the quality of one's research" (1973, p. 191).

Third, journals differ in scope. There are journals which deemphasize reports of highly professional lines of research in favor of work of a more creative or formative character. Judgments of such journals along narrow professional lines may undervalue the importance of new ideas unless worked out in compulsive detail. One respected scientist once grumbled about a noted colleague who never seemed to consider a particular line of inquiry played out, and he said that some researchers tend to "continue along the same lines at the expense of every new idea into the next millennium." The pressure of peer rankings should not serve to dam wellsprings of creativity.

Fourth, the need for faster publication can override the desire to publish in prestigious sources. The time lag in publication differs greatly between journals. For example, *The Lancet* appears weekly and publishes with only a very short delay. In contrast, *Mind* often has a publication lag of several years. In a number of fields a lag of 18 months between submission and publication is common (Sussman, 1978). Recognizing the disadvantage of long time lags, some journals feature an "immediate publication" service. Publication time is ordinarily reduced by truncating peer review procedures and quality becomes more irregular. The value to authors of publication in such journals can be high when research is dependent upon short-term grant support. Enclosing reprints is better than reporting a paper is under editorial review since it gives the review committee a concrete product to inspect. However, once such material is so "used" it cannot be republished in another journal.

Fifth, journal ranking measures are insensitive to the number of specialists

working in the various subdisciplines, which can lead to an underrating of quality research journals and overrating of review journals. For example, a demographer might not concur that the *Pacific Sociological Review* is higher than *Population.*

Finally, data on journal rankings tend to "age" fairly rapidly. The quality of journals is affected by changes in editorial staff, publishing policies, and the rate at which subfields evolve and new specializations emerge. Changes in management may either improve or damage a journal. Likewise, fragmentation of large, very successful journals into a number of more specialized publications often produces a change in quality.

Many other factors will doubtless be encountered which will have a modifying effect upon the interpretation of the rankings. However, the authors hope that the exceptions will not be so frequent or serious as to invalidate the usefulness of the data in situations where individuals are to be compared across the boundaries of departments. On the other hand, it is hoped that these data will not be expected to bear the burden of major personnel decisions alone.

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to thank Tamea Marlett and Pamela Jarvis for their help in preparation of this manuscript.

TABLES 1–7: RATINGS OF JOURNALS

TABLE 1. Anthropology

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (47) = 0.47			
High (25 or greater)			
Man	4.53	0.80	32
American Journal of Physical Anthropology	4.44	0.71	25
Current Anthropology	4.27	0.80	33
American Anthropology	4.21	1.11	33
Annual Review of Anthropology	4.00	0.90	28
Ethnology	3.76	0.75	33
Human Organization	3.48	1.03	31
Medium (8–24)			
Monographs on Social Anthropology	4.63	0.52	8
Homme	4.25	0.87	12
Journal of Anthropological Research	4.08	0.94	20
Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History	3.67	0.91	18
Journal of the Polynesian Society	3.64	0.74	14

TABLE 1. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
	Correlation of Mean to *N* (47) = 0.47		
Arctic Anthropology	3.59	0.80	17
Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie	3.58	0.84	19
Ethnomusicology	3.45	1.29	11
Anthropological Linguistics	3.33	0.92	24
Anthropos	3.26	0.92	23
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology	3.25	1.06	12
Journal of Asian and African Studies	3.21	0.80	14
Anthropologie	3.19	1.22	16
Ethnos	3.13	0.72	16
African Studies	3.13	0.89	16
Behavior Science Research	3.06	0.85	16
Anthropological Quarterly	2.96	0.75	24
Anthropologica	2.76	0.75	17
Asian Perspectives	2.73	0.88	15
Urban Anthropology	2.63	1.09	16
Anthropological Journal of Canada	2.55	1.21	11
Eastern Anthropologist	2.38	0.77	13
Mankind Quarterly	2.00	1.00	11
Low (1–7)			
Germania	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Human Evolution	3.60	0.55	5
Journal of the Anthropological Society of Hippon	3.50	0.55	6
Publications in Ethnology	3.50	0.71	2
Southwestern Journal of Anthropology	3.50	0.71	2
Journal of Canadian Studies	3.20	1.10	5
Mercury Series Ethnology Division Papers	3.17	0.75	6
Homo	3.00	0.0	3
Mankind	3.00	0.0	1
International Journal of Social Psychiatry	3.00	1.73	3
Soviet Anthropology and Archeology	2.71	0.76	7
Man in India	2.67	0.82	6
Journal of Popular Culture	2.50	1.91	4
Acta Ethnographica	2.50	0.55	6
Anthropological Communications	2.50	0.71	2
West Canadian Journal of Anthropology	2.40	1.14	5
Anthropology UCLA	2.25	1.26	4
Rater Additions			
Newsletter, American Anthropological Association	5.00	0.0	1
Bydragen tot de Taal-Land-en Volkenkuide	5.00	0.0	1

TABLE 1. ***(Continued)***

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
	Correlation of Mean to *N* (47) = 0.47		
Social Science and Medicine	5.00	0.0	1
Antiquity	5.00	0.0	1
Journal of Health and Social Behavior	5.00	0.0	1
Canadian Journal of African Studies	5.00	0.0	1
Journal of Pacific History	5.00	0.0	1
Comparative Studies in Society and History	5.00	0.0	1
Africa	4.67	0.58	3
American Ethnologist	4.57	0.79	7
Journal of Asian Studies	4.50	0.71	2
Political Anthropology	4.00	0.0	1
Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Psychismatic Research	4.00	0.0	1
Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin	4.00	0.85	15
Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society	4.00	0.0	1
Revista del Museo Nacional (Peru)	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Human Stress	4.00	0.0	1
Social Biology	4.00	0.0	1
Human Biology	4.00	0.0	2
Oceania	3.83	0.98	23
Bulletin of the American Anthropological Association	3.69	0.95	13
American Antiquity	3.67	1.15	3
World Archeology	3.50	2.12	2
Revista Colombiana de Antropologia	3.00	0.0	1
British Antiquity	3.00	0.0	1
Bulletin de la Societe Prehistorique Francaise	3.00	0.0	1
America Indigena	2.00	0.0	1
Anales de Antropologia (Mexico)	2.00	0.0	1

TABLE 2. Economics

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (84) = 0.85			
High (30 or higher)			
Econometrica	4.61	0.79	38
American Economic Review	4.59	0.88	39
Journal of Political Economy	4.45	0.99	40
Economic Journal	4.24	0.91	38
Review of Economics and Statistics	4.17	0.81	40
Economica	4.14	0.79	37
Review of Economic Studies	4.11	0.94	37
Bell Journal of Economics	3.82	0.80	34
Journal of Law and Economics	3.71	0.86	35
Journal of Economic Theory	3.70	1.10	33
Oxford Economic Papers	3.67	0.79	36
Brookings Papers on Economic Activities	3.66	0.91	35
Canadian Journal of Economics	3.50	0.76	38
Journal of Economic History	3.38	0.87	32
Southern Economic Journal	3.33	0.79	36
Western Economic Journal	3.31	0.76	35
Medium (10–29)			
Quarterly Journal of Economics	4.06	1.18	16
Economic History Review	3.39	0.78	23
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	3.36	1.03	28
Economic Development and Cultural Change	3.21	0.90	29
Economic Record	3.09	0.73	23
Land Economics	3.07	0.77	28
Explorations in Economic History	3.05	0.83	20
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics	3.00	0.87	22
Swedish Journal of Economics	2.95	0.85	19
History of Political Economy	2.89	0.96	18
Public Finance	2.89	0.68	18
Wettwirtschaftliches Archiv	2.86	0.77	14
Journal of Industrial Economics	2.85	0.88	20
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	2.85	0.69	13
Journal of Economic Issues	2.81	0.93	21
Scottish Journal of Political Economy	2.76	0.70	21
Journal of Agricultural Economics	2.69	0.87	16
International Monetary Fund	2.68	1.04	22
Australian Economic Papers	2.61	0.72	23
Economie Appliquee	2.60	1.07	10
Applied Economics	2.52	0.75	21
Quarterly Review of Economics and Business	2.48	0.90	23
Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics	2.40	0.97	10

TABLE 2. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (84) = 0.85			
American Journal of Economics and Sociology	2.40	0.76	25
Economic Geography	2.20	1.03	10
Indian Economic Journal	2.19	0.68	21
South African Journal of Economics	2.10	0.88	10
Journal of Economic Education	2.10	0.99	10
American Economist	2.05	0.58	22
Three Banks Review	1.83	0.72	12
Low (1-9)			
Economist (Netherlands)	3.13	0.99	8
Review of the Economic Conditions in Italy	3.00	2.83	2
Annales Economies Societes	2.75	1.50	4
Soviet Studies	2.67	1.37	6
Economic and Social Review	2.60	0.89	5
Revue Economique	2.50	0.55	6
German Economic Review	2.44	0.37	9
Trimestre Economico	2.40	1.34	5
Ekonomiska Samfundets Tidshrift	2.33	0.82	6
Hitosubaski Journal of Economics	2.29	0.76	7
National Tax Journal	2.25	0.96	4
Journal of Accounting Research	2.20	1.10	5
Actualite Economique	2.17	1.17	6
Journal of Developing Areas	2.11	1.17	9
Revista Internazionale Scienze Economiche E Commerciale	2.00	0.71	5
Developing Economies	2.00	0.82	7
Advanced Management Journal	2.00	1.73	3
Journal of Transport Economics and Policy	2.00	0.63	6
Annals of Regional Science	2.00	0.0	1
Review of Social Economy	2.00	0.87	9
European Economic Review	2.00	0.0	1
Problems of Economics	2.00	1.00	5
Matekon	2.00	1.41	4
Malayan Economic Review	1.88	0.83	8
National Westminster Bank Quarterly Review	1.78	0.67	9
Eastern Africa Economic Review	1.75	0.71	8
Chinese Economic Studies	1.67	0.58	3
Eastern European Economics	1.60	0.55	5
Public Finance	1.50	0.71	2
International Social Development Review	1.50	0.58	4
Betrieb	1.50	0.71	2
Studies in Comparative Communism	1.33	0.58	3

TABLE 2. ***(Continued)***

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (84) = 0.85			
Social and Economic Administration	1.00	0.0	2
Homme et la Societe	1.00	0.0	2
Review of Radical Political Economics	1.00	0.0	1
Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie	1.00	0.0	2
Problems of Communism	1.00	0.0	4
Socio-Economic Planning Sciences	1.00	0.0	2
Rater Additions			
Journal of the American Statistical Association	4.33	1.15	3
Industrial and Labor Relations Review	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Legal Studies	4.00	0.0	1
Industrial Relations	4.00	0.0	1
Public Choice	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Urban Economics	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Public Economics	4.00	1.41	2
Journal of Economic Literature	3.76	1.01	37
International Economic Review	3.71	0.95	7
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking	3.67	0.58	3
Journal of Business	3.50	0.71	2
Journal of International Economics	3.38	0.80	26
Journal of Finance	3.33	0.58	3
Journal of Econometrics	3.33	1.15	3
Staff Papers Brookings Institution	3.27	1.03	22
Annals of Economic and Social Measurement	3.00	0.0	2
Journal of Regional Science	3.00	0.0	2
Il Politico	3.00	0.0	1
Urban Economics	3.00	0.0	1
Public Economics	3.00	0.0	1
Survey of Current Business	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Economic Inquiry	3.00	0.0	1
Mercurid (Icatz)	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Human Resources	3.00	0.0	3
Journal of Environmental Economics & Management	3.00	0.0	1
Mathematical Economics	3.00	0.0	1
Public Interest	3.00	0.0	1
Mississippi Valley Journal of Business & Economics	3.00	0.0	1
Manchester Studies	3.00	0.0	1
Mauchenten School	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of International Law and Economics	2.80	1.30	5
Kyklos	2.71	0.76	7
Japanese Economic Studies	2.60	0.89	5

TABLE 2. ***(Continued)***

Correlation of Mean to N (84) = 0.85			
Title	Mean	Std Dev	N
Occasional Papers Social and Economic Studies	2.50	1.29	4
Journal of Economics and Business	2.50	1.10	18
Keio Economic Studies	2.33	1.15	3
Wharton Quarterly	2.25	1.04	8
Annales d'Economie et de Sociologie Rurrales	2.25	0.96	4
Planning and Development in the Netherlands	2.00	1.41	4
Consorration	2.00	0.0	1
Finance – Archiv	2.00	0.0	1
Eastern Economic Journal	2.00	0.0	1
Marguette Review	2.00	0.0	1
Journal of Risk and Insurance	2.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Economie Politique	2.00	0.0	1
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society	2.00	0.0	1
Metroeconomica	2.00	0.0	1
National Resources Journal	2.00	0.0	1
Economic and Business Bulletin	1.80	0.84	5
Ajia Keizai	1.50	0.71	2
Acta Ceconomica	1.33	0.58	3
Monthly Review	1.00	0.0	1
Dollars & Sense	1.00	0.0	1
New Left Review	1.00	0.0	1
Working Papers for a New Society	1.00	0.0	1
Nebraska Journal of Economics & Business	1.00	0.0	1
Revue de l'Est	1.00	0.0	1
Socialist Revolution	1.00	0.0	1
The Social Science Journal	1.00	0.0	1

TABLE 3. Geography

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (24) = −.20			
High (28 or higher)			
Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers	4.19	0.83	31
Annals of the Association of American Geographers	4.11	1.07	37
Geografiska Annaler B. Human Geography	4.00	0.67	32
Geographical Review	3.81	1.24	36
Geographical Analysis	3.73	0.94	33
Economic Geography	3.56	0.91	36
Annales de Geographie	3.55	0.91	29
Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie	3.54	0.69	28
Geographical Journal	3.53	1.06	36
Soviet Geography Review and Translation	3.07	0.92	29
Professional Geographer	2.89	0.83	35
Geography	2.80	0.81	30
Journal of Geography	2.29	0.69	31
Medium (9–27)			
Pettermans Geographische Mitteilungen	3.63	0.88	24
Geographische Zeitschrift	3.57	0.99	23
Australian Geographer	3.12	0.73	25
Australian Geographical Studies	3.11	0.66	19
Journal of Tropical Geography	3.08	0.63	26
Mitteilungen der Osterreichischen Geographischen Giseleschaf	2.92	0.95	13
Occasional Papers in Geography	2.90	1.20	10
Acta Geographica (France)	2.43	0.85	14
Low (1–8)			
Journal of Biogeography	5.00	0.0	2
Geografiska Annaler, A.	4.33	0.58	3
Canadian Geographer	4.14	0.69	7
Rater Additions			
Journal of Historical Geography	4.00	0.0	1
Erdkunde	4.00	0.0	1
Places	4.00	0.0	1
Antipode	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Developing Areas	4.00	0.0	1
Geographia Polonica	4.00	0.0	1
Zeitschrift fur Geomorphologie	4.00	1.41	2
Lund Series in Geography	4.00	1.41	2
New Zealand Geographer	4.00	0.0	2
Area	3.50	0.71	2

TABLE 3. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (24) = −.20			
Southeastern Geographer	3.50	0.58	4
Pacific Viewpoint	3.50	0.71	2
Geoforum	3.17	1.01	24
Albertan Geographer	3.00	0.0	1
Geographical Magazine	3.00	0.0	1
Fennia	3.00	0.0	1
East Lakes Geographer	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Regional Science	3.00	0.0	1
Forum	3.00	0.0	1
Scottish Geographer	3.00	0.0	1
Cahiers de Geographie de Quebec	3.00	0.0	2
Landscape	3.00	0.0	1
Terra	3.00	0.0	1
Tropical and Geographical Medicine	2.88	0.64	8
Canadian Geographical Journal	2.00	0.0	1

TABLE 4. History

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (54) = .37			
High (23 or higher)			
Economic History Review	4.30	0.61	27
Journal of American History	4.28	1.06	25
Past and Present	4.17	1.09	24
History and Theory	4.17	0.65	23
Journal of Economic History	4.04	0.79	25
Journal of Modern History	4.00	1.00	31
American Historical Review	3.96	1.10	25
Journal of the History of Ideas	3.79	0.88	28
American Scholar	3.74	0.86	23
Journal of Southern History	3.61	0.99	23
Canadian Historical Review	3.54	0.98	24
Pacific Historical Review	3.29	0.91	24
Medium (8–22)			
Historische Zeitschrift	4.24	0.90	17
Journal of African History	4.00	0.87	9
Comparative Studies in Society and History	3.80	0.95	20

TABLE 4. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (54) = .37			
Journal of Asian History	3.67	0.78	12
Business History	3.62	0.86	21
Central European History	3.57	1.09	14
Social History	3.50	0.67	12
Historical Journal	3.50	1.15	16
Slavonic and East European Review	3.50	0.93	8
International Review of Social History	3.43	0.85	14
Explorations in Economic History	3.29	0.99	14
Cahiers Histoire Mondiale—Journal of World History	3.27	1.19	11
Journal of Social History	3.25	1.13	16
Australian Journal of Politics and History	3.22	1.20	9
History of Political Economy	3.20	1.23	10
American Archivist	3.14	1.03	14
Jewish Social Studies	3.13	0.99	8
History	3.11	0.94	19
Southwestern Historical Quarterly	2.82	0.75	11
Journal of Negro History	2.75	0.93	16
Canadian Review of American Studies	2.60	1.26	10
History of Education Quarterly	2.58	0.90	12
Canadian Slavonic Papers	2.56	1.24	9
Phylon	2.50	0.76	8
Low (1–7)			
William and Mary Quarterly	4.67	0.22	3
Catholic Historical Review	4.00	0.0	1
The Historian	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Interdisciplinary History	4.00	1.00	4
English Historical Review	4.00	1.00	3
Hispanic American Historical Review	4.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Histoire de l'Amerique Francaise	3.50	1.29	4
Slavic and East European Journal	3.33	1.21	6
Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines	3.33	1.03	6
Archives	3.25	0.96	4
International Journal of African Historical Studies	3.14	1.07	7
American West	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Southeastern Asian Studies	3.00	1.10	6
European Studies Review	3.00	1.10	6
Societas	3.00	0.0	1
Military Affairs	3.00	0.0	1
American Quarterly	3.00	0.0	1
Occasional Papers in Economic and Social History	1.50	0.71	2

TABLE 4. ***(Continued)***

Correlation of Mean to N (54) = .37			
Title	Mean	Std Dev	N
Rater Additions			
Journal of Asian Studies	5.00	0.0	1
Geschichte und Gesellschaft	5.00	0.0	1
Rivista Storica Haliana	5.00	0.0	1
American Slavic & E European Review	5.00	0.0	1
History of Science	5.00	0.0	1
Slavic Review	4.00	1.41	2
Church History	4.00	0.0	1
Sixteenth Century Journal	4.00	0.0	1
Cahiers de Monde Russe et Sovietique	4.00	0.0	1
Isis	4.00	0.0	1
New Literary History	4.00	0.0	1
Annales	4.00	0.0	1
Studi Storici	4.00	0.0	1
Geschichte in Wissenschaff and Unterricht	4.00	0.0	1
Quaderni Storice Delle Marche	4.00	0.0	1
Annals	4.00	0.0	1
Victorian Studies	4.00	0.0	1
Verteljahrbac H des Zatgeschichte	4.00	0.0	1
Revue Historique	4.00	1.41	2
Journal of European Economic History	4.00	0.0	1
Historical Methods Newsletter	4.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Historie de la Deuxieme Guerre Mondiale	4.00	0.0	1
Daedelus	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of British Studies	3.50	0.71	2
Technology and Culture	3.00	0.0	1
Louisiana History	3.00	0.0	1
Civil War History	3.00	0.0	1
Speculum	3.00	0.0	1
Alabama Review	3.00	0.0	1
Albion	3.00	0.0	1
Asian Studies	3.00	0.0	1
Russian Review	2.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Historie Moderne et Contemporaine	2.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique	1.00	0.0	1

TABLE 5. Philosophy

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (39) = .38			
High (23 or higher)			
Philosophical Review	4.60	0.62	30
American Philosophical Quarterly	4.35	0.66	31
British Journal of Philosophy of Science	4.21	0.74	28
Philosophy of Science	4.04	0.72	26
Mind	3.90	0.87	31
Review of Metaphysics	3.80	1.06	30
Philosophy	3.57	0.66	23
Monist	3.47	0.82	30
Ethics	3.46	0.71	26
Journal of the History of Ideas	3.44	0.70	27
Philosophy and Public Affairs	3.42	0.97	24
Inquiry	3.25	0.61	24
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research	3.18	0.98	28
International Philosophical Quarterly	2.72	1.10	25
Personalist	2.17	0.76	24
Medium (8–22)			
Journal of Philosophy	4.33	0.89	12
Philosophical Studies	3.76	0.62	21
Theory and Decision	3.58	0.90	12
Theoria (Sweden)	3.45	0.74	22
Ratio (England)	3.27	0.63	22
History and Theory	3.27	0.80	15
Daedalus	3.09	1.04	11
Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society	2.75	0.97	12
Philosophy East and West	2.32	0.95	22
Philosophy Forum	2.32	0.75	19
Southwestern Journal of Philosophy	2.24	1.00	21
Dialogue (U.S.)	2.00	0.87	9
Low (1–7)			
Synthese	4.33	0.58	3
Tijdschrift voor Filosofie	3.50	0.71	2
Modern Schoolman	3.50	0.71	2
Philosophical Journal	3.33	1.15	3
Journal of the British Society of Phenomenology	3.14	0.69	7
Soviet Studies in Philosophy	3.00	1.10	6
Etudes Philosophique	3.00	0.0	3
American Scholar	2.86	1.07	7
Journal of the American Academy of Religion	2.60	0.55	5
Transactions of the American Philosophical Society	2.50	1.38	6

TABLE 5. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
	Correlation of Mean to *N* (39) = .38		
Humanitas	2.00	0.82	4
Journal of Thought	1.67	0.58	3
Rater Additions			
Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society	5.00	0.0	1
Journal of Symbolic Logic	5.00	0.0	2
Revue de Metaphysique et Morale	5.00	0.0	1
Proceedings Supplementary Vol.	5.00	0.0	1
Kant Studien	4.67	0.58	3
Journal of the History of Philosophy	4.33	0.58	3
Nous	4.20	0.45	5
Hegel-Studien	4.00	0.0	1
Thomist	4.00	0.0	1
Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour	4.00	0.0	1
Religious Studies (U.K.)	4.00	0.0	1
Idealist Studies	4.00	0.0	1
Philosophy (Royal Institute of Philosophy)	4.00	0.0	1
Logique et Analyse	4.00	0.0	1
Phil. Rundschau	4.00	0.0	1
Man and World	4.00	0.0	1
Canadian Journal of Philosophy	3.83	0.41	6
Analysis	3.80	0.45	5
Journal of Philosophical Logic	3.69	0.70	16
Australasian Journal of Philosophy	3.67	0.58	3
Philosophical Quarterly	3.65	0.63	26
Journal of Value Inquiry	3.50	0.71	2
New Scholasticism	3.50	0.71	2
Dialogue (Canadian)	3.20	0.84	5
Sophia (Australian)	3.00	0.0	1
Philosophy and Rhetoric	3.00	0.0	1
Social Theory and Practice	3.00	0.0	1
Metaphilosophy	3.00	1.41	2
Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy	3.00	0.0	1
Idealistic Studies	3.00	0.0	1
Critica	3.00	0.0	1
Southern Journal of Philosophy	2.50	0.55	6
Studies in Philosophy and Education	2.40	0.55	5
International Journal for Philosophy of Religion	2.00	0.0	1
Main Currents of Modern Thought	1.75	0.50	4

TABLE 6. Political Science

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (63) = .24			
High (25 or higher)			
American Political Science Review	4.24	0.66	33
American Journal of Political Science	3.71	0.94	31
British Journal of Political Science	3.69	1.07	29
Journal of Politics	3.66	0.83	32
Foreign Affairs	3.44	1.01	27
Comparative Politics	3.41	0.97	27
Journal of Conflict Resolution	3.33	0.88	27
Canadian Journal of Political Science	3.24	0.95	29
Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics	3.15	0.95	27
Polity	3.11	0.97	27
Comparative Political Studies	3.04	0.71	27
Western Political Quarterly	2.96	0.82	26
Review of Politics	2.88	0.88	25
Annals of the American Academy Political and Social Science	2.82	0.98	33
P.S.	2.19	1.02	26
Medium (8–24)			
World Politics	4.13	0.81	23
Revue Francaise de Science Politique	3.93	0.83	14
Studies in Comparative International Development	3.38	1.06	8
Government and Opposition	3.25	0.68	24
Political Studies (London)	3.20	1.23	10
International Studies Quarterly	3.20	0.89	20
Politics and Society	3.11	1.13	18
Ethics	3.09	0.83	11
Political Science Quarterly	3.08	0.65	24
Asian Survey	3.00	0.96	14
Political Theory	3.00	0.78	14
Political Quarterly	2.95	0.84	22
Studies in Comparative Communism	2.91	0.70	11
Problems of Communism	2.89	0.94	19
Political Science	2.83	1.19	12
Publius The Journal of Federalism	2.77	1.01	13
Teaching Political Science	2.73	0.65	11
American Politics Quarterly	2.71	0.86	24
Journal of Political and Military Sociology	2.67	0.71	9
Australian Journal of Politics and History	2.60	0.99	15
Journal of Peace Research	2.58	1.07	19
Journal of Developing Areas	2.41	1.00	17
Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science	2.40	1.07	10

TABLE 6. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (63) = .24			
Current History	2.09	0.87	22
Indian Political Science Review	1.63	0.81	16
Low (1-7)			
Foreign Policy	5.00	0.0	1
Pacific Affairs	5.00	0.0	1
Public Choice	4.00	0.0	1
Policy Studies Journal	4.00	0.0	1
Zeitschrift fur Politik	3.00	1.00	3
Studies in Communism, Revisionism, and Revolution	3.00	0.0	2
Europa-Archiv	3.00	1.00	5
The Parliamentarian	3.00	0.0	1
Parliamentary Affairs	3.00	0.0	1
History of Political Economy	3.00	0.0	1
Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines	2.67	0.82	6
Modern Law and Society	2.67	0.58	3
Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs	2.29	0.95	7
European Studies Review	2.20	0.84	5
Politische Studien Munich	2.00	0.0	2
International Review of History and Political Science	2.00	0.0	1
Soviet Law and Government	2.00	1.41	2
Bildung und Erziehung	2.00	0.0	1
Youth and Society	2.00	1.41	2
Osterreichische Zeitschrift fur Polilikuissenschaft	2.00	0.0	2
Scottish Journal of Political Economy	2.00	0.0	1
Studies in Chinese Government and Politics	2.00	1.41	2
Aussen Politik	1.83	0.75	6
Rater Additions			
Canadian Public Policy	5.00	0.0	1
Public Administration Review	5.00	0.0	2
Journal of Asian Studies	5.00	0.0	1
Social Science Quarterly	5.00	0.0	1
The Public Interest	5.00	0.0	1
China Quarterly	5.00	0.0	1
Law and Society	4.00	0.0	1
Public Administration Quarterly	4.00	0.0	1
Canadian Public Administration	4.00	0.0	1

TABLE 6. ***(Continued)***

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (63) = .24			
Science and Society	4.00	0.0	1
Policy Analysis	4.00	0.0	1
Public Policy	4.00	0.0	2
Economic Studies	4.00	0.0	1
Interpretation	4.00	0.0	1
Law and Society Review	4.00	0.0	1
Orbis	4.00	0.0	2
Policy Sciences	4.00	0.0	1
National Law Reviews (Harvard, Yale, etc.)	4.00	0.0	1
Political Science Reviewer	3.50	0.71	2
International Philosophical Quarterly	3.50	0.71	2
Foro International	3.33	1.15	3
Journal of Comparative Administration	3.24	1.09	17
New Left Review	3.00	0.0	1
Queen's Quarterly	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Modern African Studies	3.00	0.0	1
Canadian Diversion	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Canadian Studies	3.00	0.0	1
Ethnicity	3.00	0.0	1
Local Law Reviews (Ohio State, Cincinnati)	3.00	0.0	1
Administrative Science Quarterly	3.00	0.0	1
Canadian Forum	3.00	0.0	1
Il Politico	2.00	0.0	1

TABLE 7. Sociology

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
	Correlation of Mean to *N* (70) = .47		
High (26 or higher)			
American Journal of Sociology	4.24	1.26	34
American Sociological Review	4.17	1.32	35
Sociometry	3.81	1.11	27
Social Forces	3.79	1.14	33
British Journal of Sociology	3.68	1.07	34
Social Problems	3.57	0.94	30
Journal of Marriage and the Family	3.42	0.81	26
American Sociologist	3.09	1.06	34
Pacific Sociological Review	3.04	0.82	26
Medium (9–22)			
Archives Europeennes de Sociologie	4.00	0.94	10
Sociology—The Journal of the British Sociological Association	3.80	0.95	20
Population	3.64	0.84	14
Rural Sociology	3.62	0.65	13
Economic Development and Cultural Change	3.60	0.84	10
Acta Sociologica	3.47	0.83	15
Current Sociology	3.43	0.85	14
Sociological Inquiry	3.42	0.78	24
Sociological Quarterly	3.40	0.82	20
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology	3.30	0.92	20
Human Relations	3.24	0.77	21
Sociology of Education	3.15	0.75	20
Sociological Review	3.12	0.78	17
Sociology and Social Research	3.04	0.69	24
American Journal of Economics and Sociology	3.00	0.73	16
International Journal of Comparative Sociology	3.00	0.67	10
Criminology	3.00	0.82	10
Sociological Analysis	2.82	0.87	11
Sociological Focus	2.71	0.73	14
Journal of Political and Military Sociology	2.55	0.69	11
Low (1–8)			
Sociologie du Travail	4.60	0.55	5
Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie	4.25	0.71	8
Kolner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozial Psycologie	4.17	0.75	6
Revue Francaise de Sociologie	3.88	1.55	8
Population Studies (London)	3.71	0.95	7
Social Biology	3.67	0.82	6

TABLE 7. (*Continued*)

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (70) = .47			
Sociologie et Societes	3.67	1.53	3
Homme et la Societe	3.50	0.71	2
Social Science and Medicine	3.50	0.58	4
Revue de Institute de Sociologie	3.33	1.15	3
International Review of Social History	3.25	0.96	4
Sociologia Ruralis	3.25	0.96	4
Ethics	3.25	1.50	4
Economic and Social Review	3.17	0.75	6
Soviet Sociology	3.14	1.21	7
Journal of Asian and African Studies	3.13	0.99	8
International Social Science Journal	3.00	0.76	8
Jewish Social Studies	3.00	0.82	4
Polish Sociological Bulletin	3.00	0.89	6
International Journal of Social Psychiatry	3.00	1.00	3
International Journal of Contemporary Sociology	2.86	0.38	7
Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology	2.80	0.84	5
Jewish Journal of Sociology	2.80	0.84	5
Modern Law and Society	2.67	1.15	3
Chinese Sociology and Anthropology	2.60	0.55	5
Journal of Leisure Research	2.57	0.53	7
Environment and Behavior	2.50	0.58	4
Race	2.50	0.58	4
Social Compass	2.50	0.84	6
Journal of Human Resources	2.40	0.55	5
Sociological Symposium	2.33	1.15	3
Cornell Journal of Social Relations	2.29	0.49	7
Family Process	2.20	0.84	5
Sociological Bulletin	2.20	0.84	5
Adolescence	2.00	0.82	4
Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine	2.00	0.0	1
National Council for the Social Studies Yearbook	2.00	0.0	1
Socio-economic Planning Studies	2.00	0.0	2
International Journal of the Addictions	1.67	0.58	3
Bulletin of Narcotics	1.67	0.58	3
Social and Economic Administration	1.00	0.0	2
Rater Supplied			
Journal of Mathematical Sociology	5.00	0.0	2
Contemporary Studies in Society and History	5.00	0.0	1
Science	5.00	0.0	1
Daedalus	5.00	0.0	1
Monthly Review	5.00	0.0	1

TABLE 7. ***(Continued)***

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (70) = .47			
Demography	4.50	0.58	4
Inquiry (Helsinki)	4.00	0.0	1
Social Sciences Quarterly	4.00	0.0	1
Administrative Science Quarterly	4.00	0.0	1
Psychology Today	4.00	0.0	1
Journal of Health and Social Behavior	4.00	0.0	1
Society (Trans-action)	4.00	0.0	1
American Behavioral Scientist	4.00	0.0	1
Revista Latinoamerica de Sociologia	4.00	0.0	1
American Anthropologist	4.00	0.0	1
Public Opinion Quarterly	4.00	0.0	1
Revista Mexiana de Sociologia	4.00	0.0	1
Annales d'Economie et de Sociologie Rurrales	4.00	0.0	1
Zeitschrift fur Soziologie	3.75	0.96	4
Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly	3.72	0.89	18
International Review of Modern Sociology	3.67	0.58	3
Canadian Journal of Sociology	3.50	0.71	2
Sociological Methods and Research	3.50	0.82	16
Contemporary Sociology	3.46	1.04	28
European Journal of Social Psychology	3.25	0.96	4
Archives of Sexual Behavior	3.20	1.10	5
Social Research	3.16	0.69	19
Civilisations	3.00	0.0	1
Kyklos	3.00	0.0	1
Urban Economics	3.00	0.0	1
Health and Human Behavior	3.00	0.0	1
Science and Society	3.00	0.0	1
Survey of Current Business	3.00	0.0	1
International Journal of Sociology of the Family	3.00	0.82	7
Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Law and Society	3.00	0.0	1
Journal of Voluntary Action Research	2.33	0.52	6
Social Studies—Irish Journal of Sociologie	2.33	0.58	3
Wharton Quarterly	2.25	1.04	8
Indian Journal of Social Research	2.00	0.76	8
Revue de l'Est	2.00	0.0	2
But Tour Crimonology	2.00	0.0	1
Revue d'Economie Politique	2.00	0.0	1
International Review of Sport Sociology	2.00	0.0	1
Advanced Management Journal	2.00	1.73	3
African Social Research	2.00	0.0	1

TABLE 7. ***(Continued)***

Title	Mean	Std Dev	*N*
Correlation of Mean to *N* (70) = .47			
Sociology (British)	2.00	0.0	1
Sport Sociology Bulletin	2.00	0.0	1
National Council for the Social Studies Readings	1.50	0.71	2
National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin	1.50	0.71	2
National Council for the Social Studies Research Bulletin	1.50	0.71	2
Studies in Comparative Communism	1.33	0.58	3
Working Papers for a New Society	1.00	0.0	1
Socialist Revolution	1.00	0.0	1
The Social Science Journal	1.00	0.0	1

REFERENCES

Baughman, J. C. A structural analysis of the literature of sociology. *The Library Quarterly,* 1974, *44,* 293–308.

Chubin, D. On the use of the Science Citation Index in sociology. *The American Sociologist,* 1973, *8,* 187–191.

Cole, J., and Cole, S. Measuring the quality of sociological research: problems in the use of the Science Citation Index. *The American Sociologist,* 1971, *6,* 23–29.

Garfield, E. Citation indexes in sociological and historical research. *American Documentation,* 1963, 289–291.

Glenn, N. D. American sociologists' evaluations of sixty-three journals. *The American Sociologist,* 1971, *6,* 298–303.

Line, M. B. The influence of the type of sources used on the results of citation analysis. *The Journal of Documentation,* 1979, *35,* 265–284.

Mace, K. C., and Warner, H. D. Ratings of psychology journals. *American Psychologist,* February 1973, 184–186.

Martyn, J. Citation analysis. *The Journal of Documentation,* 1975, *31,* 290–297.

McAllister, P. R., Anderson, R. C., and Narin, F. Comparison of peer and citation assessment of the influence of scientific journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science,* 1980, *31,* 147–152.

Rushton, J. P., and Roediger III, H. L. An evaluation of 80 psychology journals based on the Science Citation Index. *American Psychologist,* 1978, *33,* 520–523.

Singleton, A. Journal ranking and selection: a review in physics. *Journal of Documentation,* 1976, *32,* 258–289.

Sussman, M. B. *Author's guide to journals in sociology and related fields.* New York: Haworth Press, 1978.

Teevan, J. J. Journal prestige and quality of sociological articles. *The American Sociologist,* 1980, *15,* 109–112.

Received August 16, 1982